

Translating PL/I Macro Procedures into Java Using Automatic Templatzation and Large Language Models

Takaaki Tateishi
IBM Research
Tokyo, Japan
tate@jp.ibm.com

Yasuharu Katsuno
IBM Research
Tokyo, Japan
katsuno@jp.ibm.com

Abstract

Modernizing legacy enterprise systems often involves translating PL/I programs into modern languages such as Java. This task becomes significantly more complex when PL/I macro procedures are involved. The PL/I macro procedures are considered string-manipulating programs that generate PL/I code, and they make automated translation more complex. Recently, large language models (LLMs) have been explored for automated code translation. However, LLM-based code translation struggles to translate the PL/I macro procedures to Java programs that reproduce the behavior of the plain PL/I code generated by the original PL/I macro procedures.

This paper proposes a novel method called templatzation, which uses symbolic execution to generate code templates (code with named placeholders) as an intermediate representation. In this approach, symbolic values are treated as parts of macro-generated code. By symbolically executing macro procedures and generating code templates, our approach facilitates LLMs to generate readable and maintainable Java code. Our preliminary experiment on ten PL/I macro procedures shows that the LLM-based translation through templatzation successfully generates Java programs that reproduce the behavior of the macro-generated PL/I programs.

Keywords

PL/I macro, LLM-based translation, symbolic execution, modernization

Introduction

Legacy programs written using PL/I are still widely used in enterprise systems. However, modernizing these systems often involves translating PL/I programs into a modern language like Java. Recently, approaches using machine learning and pretrained large language models (LLMs) have been actively explored for code translation tasks [6, 9]. The syntax of PL/I closely resembles that of modern procedural languages. Our preliminary investigation confirms that many recent LLMs are capable of translating plain PL/I programs, which are composed solely of basic control statements (e.g., conditionals and procedure calls) and arithmetic expressions, into equivalent Java programs.

However, a significant challenge arises when PL/I programs include macro procedures. (1) PL/I macro procedures can be regarded as string-manipulating programs that generate PL/I programs. Unlike PL/I, Java lacks a code-generation mechanism similar to PL/I macro procedures. (2) These macro procedures are written using PL/I, and the strings manipulated within them correspond to the PL/I programs to be generated. To the best of our knowledge, no existing papers have addressed such programs. (3) If the concrete

string values passed to macro procedures are known, macro expansion can be performed by interpreting the macro instructions, resulting in plain PL/I code. However, macro procedures are typically reused across multiple PL/I programs, and we obtain multiple macro-expanded PL/I programs from a single macro procedure. When these are translated into Java, they result in multiple Java programs, which compromises the original modularity.

Our Approach: Given the above challenges, we employ the translation process illustrated in Figure 1. This pipeline translates PL/I to Java through two separate paths: one for plain PL/I code and another for PL/I macro procedures. In this paper, we focus on the path for PL/I macro procedures, as plain PL/I code can be directly translated into Java by an LLM. For PL/I macro procedures, we first translate them to PL/I templates that represent the code generated by the macro procedures, which we refer to as *templatzation*. This templatzation process is performed through symbolic execution tailored for handling code-generating code. Each resulting template consists of two components: a definition part and a code part. The definition parts of the templates are translated into Java using straightforward rules that make use of the execution traces obtained through symbolic execution, the details of which are omitted in this paper. The code parts of the templates are translated into Java code with annotations using the same LLM and a prompt extended to handle placeholders in the PL/I templates. These annotations simulate the behavior of PL/I macro procedures. This approach preserves the modularity and maintainability of the original code, enabling the LLM to generate Java programs that reproduce the behavior of the macro-generated PL/I programs.

Contributions: The contributions of this paper are as follows: (1) PL/I template generation through symbolic execution tailored for PL/I macro processing. To the best of our knowledge, ours is the first application of symbolic execution used in this manner. (2) Java annotations that implement the parameterized variable names to accommodate variable names generated by the PL/I macro procedures.

Organization: This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces related work. Section 3 describes our proposed method. Section 4 demonstrates the effectiveness of templatzation through experiments. Finally, Section 5 outlines our future plans, and Section 6 concludes this paper.

2 Related Work

Recent advancements in LLMs has resulted in growing interest in automated code translation, especially for legacy programming languages such as COBOL [9] and FORTRAN [8]. Several recent approaches enhance LLM-based code translation by integrating external sources of semantic or structural information as we leverage




Figure 1: Overview of Translation from PL/I to Java

```

1 %UPDITEMAX: PROC(PREFIX,MAX,X1,X2) RETURNS(CHAR);
2   DCL PREFIX CHAR;
3   DCL MAX CHAR;
4   DCL X1 CHAR;
5   DCL X2 CHAR;
6   DCL S CHAR;
7   S = '';
8   IF X2 = '' THEN
9     DO;
10    S = S||'IF '||PREFIX||X1||' >= '||PREFIX||MAX||' THEN ';
11    S = S||' '||PREFIX||MAX||' = '||PREFIX||X1||'; ';
12    END;
13  ELSE
14    DO;
15    S = S||'IF '||PREFIX||X1||' >= '||PREFIX||X2||' THEN ';
16    S = S||' '||PREFIX||MAX||' = '||PREFIX||X1||'; ';
17    S = S||'ELSE ';
18    S = S||' '||PREFIX||MAX||' = '||PREFIX||X2||'; ';
19    END;
20  RETURN(S);
21  %END;
  
```

Figure 2: PL/I macro procedure

```

1 @PLIVariable(name="prefixX1", value="{_PREFIX_}{_X1_}", type="int")
2 @PLIVariable(name="prefixX2", value="{_PREFIX_}{_X2_}", type="int")
3 @PLIVariable(name="prefixMax", value="{_PREFIX_}{_MAX_}", type="int")
4 public void targetMethod(String _PREFIX_, String _MAX_,
5     String _X1_, String _X2_) {
6     boolean x0 = (_X2_ = '');
7     if(x0) {
8         if (getPrefixX1() >= getPrefixMax()) {
9             setPrefixMax(getPrefixX1());
10        }
11    } else {
12        if (getPrefixX1() >= getPrefixX2()) {
13            setPrefixMax(getPrefixX1());
14        } else {
15            setPrefixMax(getPrefixX2());
16        }
17    }
18 }
  
```

Figure 3: Generated Java code

symbolic execution and code template. CoTrans [5] incorporates compiler feedback and symbolic execution during fine-tuning, allowing the model to learn from program behavior and improve accuracy. INTERTRANS [7] uses intermediate programming languages as semantic bridges to harness the multilingual capabilities of code LLMs. LLMLIFT [3] combines LLMs with formal verification, which uses a symbolic solver, to ensure that translated code preserves the original program’s semantics and correctness.

Collectively, these studies demonstrate the growing capabilities of LLMs in code translation. Still, there are challenges in handling code that generates other code, such as macro procedures, which require specialized techniques like our templatzation.

3 LLM-based Translation Through Templatzation

In this section, we first describe the syntax of the PL/I macro procedures targeted for our approach and the structure of the expected Java code generated by the LLM-based translation including our custom Java annotations. We then explain the details of the templatzation process. Finally, we present the prompt design used to guide the LLMs in generating such annotated Java code.

3.1 PL/I Macro Procedures and Corresponding Java Methods

PL/I macro language has a syntax similar to that of the PL/I language, but the values are limited to strings and numbers. Figure 2 shows an example of a PL/I macro procedure that generates PL/I code to update a maximum value. Note that this macro procedure takes 4 parameters: PREFIX, MAX, X1, and X2. Each parameter represents a string used to construct variable names.

A simplified subset of the syntax of PL/I macro procedures [4] is defined as follows:

```

expression  e ::= x | s | n
              | e1 || e2 | e1=e2 | F(e1, ...) | ...

statement   stmt ::= x=e;
              | IF e THEN stmts ELSE stmts END
              | DO WHILE e; stmts END
              | DO stmts END

statements  stmts ::= stmt; ... ; stmt;

procedure   mproc ::=
              %name: PROC (x1, x2, ...) RETURNS CHAR;
              stmts RETURN(e); END
  
```

Expressions e consist of variables x , strings s , and numbers n . They may also include concatenation $e_1 || e_2$ and other string operations $F(e_1, \dots)$ such as substring extraction, where the subscripted e also represents an expression. Statements $stmt$ include assignments, conditional branches, while-loops, and statement blocks, where a sequence of statements $stmts$ consists of multiple statements separated by semicolons. A macro procedure named $name$ is defined using % and PROC.

```

1 Symbolic values:
2   x0 = (X2 = '')
3
4 Return values:
5   {#if(#0)}
6   IF {_PREFIX_}{_X1_} >= {_PREFIX_}{_MAX_}
7   THEN {_PREFIX_}{_MAX_} = {_PREFIX_}{_X1_};
8   {#else}
9   IF {_PREFIX_}{_X1_} >= {_PREFIX_}{_X2_}
10  THEN {_PREFIX_}{_MAX_} = {_PREFIX_}{_X1_};
11  ELSE {_PREFIX_}{_MAX_} = {_PREFIX_}{_X2_};
12  {#endif}

```

Figure 4: PL/I template

We expect that the Java methods generated from the PL/I macro procedures by an LLM reproduce the behavior of the original macro-generated PL/I programs. Therefore, the generated Java methods are designed to take parameters of type String, which serve as meta-variables similar to those in the original macro procedures, as shown in Figure 3. These meta-variables are used to determine the actual variable names in the generated code, and the resolved names are then used to obtain the corresponding values. To simplify the retrieval of the values through these meta-variables, we introduce the annotation `@PLIVariable(name, value, type)`, which automatically defines corresponding setter and getter methods.

An annotation processor interprets such annotations and generate setter and getter methods that maintain the relationship between variable names, values, and types using a key-value store. For example, the following is the implementation of the getter method `getPrefixX1()`, which corresponds to the annotation `@PLIVariable(name="prefixX1", value="{_PREFIX_}{_X1_}", type="int")` shown in Figure 3:

```

1 public int getPrefixX1() {
2     String varName = this.metavar.get("PREFIX") + this.metavar.get("X1");
3     Object obj = this.kv.get(varName);
4     return (Integer)obj;
5 }

```

, where the variable `varName` is assigned the concatenated string that is represented by `"{_PREFIX_}{_X1_}"` and consists of the values of `PREFIX` and `X1`. Using this computed name, the method retrieves the corresponding value from the key-value store `this.kv`, performs the appropriate type conversion, and returns the result.

3.2 Templization Based on Symbolic Execution

Figure 4 shows the template generated from the macro procedure in Figure 2 through symbolic execution, which is referred to as templization. In our symbolic execution, a symbolic value v is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 v &::= [w_1, \dots, w_n] && \text{(symbolic value)} \\
 &| ("call", F, v_1, v_2, \dots) && \text{(function call)} \\
 w &::= s && \text{(string literal)} \\
 &| x && \text{(variable)} \\
 &| ("if", x) | ("else") | ("endif") && \text{(conditional constructs)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, a symbolic value abstracts macro-generated code, which consists of code fragments represented as text. Conditional constructs allow two distinct code fragments, denoted by symbolic values v_1 and v_2 , to be encoded as a single symbolic value: $[("if", x_3)] +$

$v_1 + [("else")] + v_2 + [("endif")]$, where x_3 is a conditional variable, and $+$ represents list concatenation.

Given a sequence of statements $stmt_1; \dots; stmt_n$ and variables x_1, \dots, x_m as parameters of a macro procedure, we derive a template from the symbolic state σ' , which is obtained through symbolic execution $\sigma' = \theta(stmt_1; \dots; stmt_n, \sigma)$, where the initial state is defined as $\sigma = \{x_1 \mapsto x_1, \dots, x_m \mapsto x_m\}$.

The resulting symbolic state σ' constitutes the definition part of the template. The code part of the template is constructed by extracting the symbolic value associated with the return variable. For example, the symbolic value $[("if", x_3), x_1, ("else"), x_2, ("endif")]$ is encoded in the template as `{#if(#3)}{#1}{#else}{#2}{#endif}`, where the symbolic values are enclosed in braces and prefixed with `#` to indicate placeholders, except for the symbolic values associated with the parameters of the macro procedures, which retain their original names (e.g., `{_MAX_}`).

To define symbolic execution θ , we further simplify the PL/I macro language to the following types of statements:

$x = s$ (string substitution)
 $x = x_1 \mid x_2$ (concatenation)
 $x = F(x_1, \dots)$ (string operation)
 IF x THEN $stmts$ ELSE $stmts$ END (conditional branch)

, where x, s, F and $stmts$ represent variables, string values, function symbols, and lists of statements, respectively. Note that loops are assumed to be unrolled when the number of iterations is fixed. If the loop condition depends on symbolic values, we unroll the loop for a fixed number of iterations by replacing the loop condition with conditional statements. We then rely on the downstream LLM-based translation to merge and simplify the resulting code.

The state update rules for $\sigma' = \theta(stmt, \sigma)$ are defined as follows.

- **Assignment:** If $stmt = x=s$, then $\sigma' = \sigma[x \mapsto s]$.
- **Concatenation:** If $stmt = x=x_1 \mid x_2$, then $\sigma' = \sigma[x \mapsto \sigma(x_1) + \sigma(x_2)]$.
- **Function call** (e.g., substring): If $stmt = x=F(x_1, \dots)$, then

$$\sigma' = \begin{cases} \sigma[x \mapsto [F(\sigma(x_1), \dots)]] & \text{if all } \sigma(x_i) \text{ are concrete} \\ \sigma[x \mapsto [x']], & \text{otherwise} \\ x' \mapsto ("call", F, \sigma(x_1), \dots) & x' \text{ is a fresh variable} \end{cases}$$
- **Conditional statement:** If $stmt = \text{IF } x \text{ THEN } then-stmts \text{ ELSE } else-stmts \text{ END}$, then symbolic execution proceeds as follows:
 - we symbolically execute *then-stmts* and *else-stmts* and obtain $\sigma' = \theta(then-stmts, \sigma)$, and $\sigma' = \theta(else-stmts, \sigma)$.
 - For every variable x' in σ' , x' is updated only in *then-stmts*, then $\sigma' := \sigma[x' \mapsto v']$, where $v' = [("if", x)] + \sigma'(x) + [("endif")]$
 - If x' is updated only in *else-stmts*, then $\sigma' := \sigma[x' \mapsto v']$, where $v' = [("if", x), ("else")] + \sigma''(x) + [("endif")]$
 - If x' is updated in both branches, then $\sigma' := \sigma[x' \mapsto x']$, where $v' = [("if", x)] + \sigma'(x) + [("else")] + \sigma''(x) + [("endif")]$

Here, $v_1 + v_2$ represents the list concatenation of two symbolic values v_1 and v_2 . A fresh variable x' is introduced to represent the result of a function call whose arguments are not all concrete, and to prevent the function call from appearing in a template. We naturally

```

1 # Example of Translation From PL/I to Java
2 ## PL/I:
3 /* MP: BEGIN TEAMPLTE */
4 /* comment */
5 A{ _BAR_ }B = X{ _FOO_ }Y + 1;
6 /* MP: END TEMPLATE */
7 ## Java and Annotations:
8 @PLIVariable(name="aBarB", value="A{ _BAR_ }B", type="int")
9 @PLIVariable(name="xFooY", value="X{ _FOO_ }Y", type="int")
10 public void targetMethod() {
11     this.log("/* comment */");
12     setABarB(getXFooY() + 1);
13 }
14 ... insert as many examples as necessary here ...
15
16 # Question:
17 Translate the following PL/I code into Java according to the above examples.
18 Each consecutive placeholder (e.g., { _X_ }{ _Y_ }) represents a single variable.
19 ## Answer Format:
20 * The resulting Java code should be enclosed by "```java" and "```end".
21 # Answer:

```

Figure 5: The prompt for translating PL/I template into Java

```

1 { _V_ } = 10{#if(#1)} + { _X_ }{#endif};

2
3 @PLIVariable(name="v", value="{ _V_ }", type="int")
4 @PLIVariable(name="x", value="{ _X_ }", type="int")
5 public void targetMethod() {
6     if (x1) { setV(10 + getX()); }
7     else { setV(10); }
8 }

```

Figure 6: An Example of an Unbalanced Template

extend θ to sequence of statements as $\theta(stmt_1; \dots; stmt_n, \sigma) = \theta(stmt_n, \dots, \theta(stmt_1, \sigma))$.

3.3 LLM Translation

Figure 5 illustrates the prompt design used for translating PL/I templates into Java code using an LLM. Lines 1–13 present an in-context example that demonstrates the correspondence between a PL/I template and its translated Java code. This example considers the following patterns: (1) Construction patterns of PL/I variable names using meta-variables, (2) Usage patterns of variables, and (3) Comment patterns. Additional in-context examples are inserted to cover other patterns in a similar manner. Lines 17–21 provide explicit instructions to the LLM. To programmatically extract the generated Java code from the LLM response, the prompt instructs the LLM to enclose the resulting Java code between the markers "```java" and "```end".

4 Experiment

To evaluate the effectiveness of the method, we created 10 realistic PL/I macro procedures, comprising a total of 146 lines of code with 15 conditional branches and 5 built-in functions such as SUBSTR, including the one shown in Figure 2. Our implementation of symbolic execution for PL/I macro procedures successfully processed all the macro procedures and generated corresponding PL/I templates. We then translated these templates into Java code using two LLMs: Llama-4-Scout-17B-16E-Instruct [1] and Mistral-Small-3.2-24B-Instruct-2506 [2]. All templates were successfully translated into the expected Java methods. Even in cases where the conditional constructs in the template and the sentences generated by

```

1 static String updateMax(String prefix, String max, String x1, String x2) {
2     StringBuilder s = new StringBuilder();
3     if (x2.isEmpty()) {
4         s.append("if (").append(prefix).append(x1).append(" >= ")
5         .append(prefix).append(max).append(") {\n");
6         s.append(" ").append(prefix).append(max).append(" = ")
7         .append(prefix).append(x1).append(";\n");
8         s.append("}\n");
9     } else {
10         ...
11     }
12     return s.toString();
13 }

```

Figure 7: Java Code Generated by Llama-4-Scout

the macro procedure are unbalanced, as shown in Figure 6, the translation was successfully achieved. Such macro procedures are commonly found in real-world code, and this highlights one of the advantages of using LLMs.

For comparison with the naive direct application of LLMs, we conducted an additional experiment in which we asked the LLMs to translate the original PL/I macro procedures directly into Java. However, none of the macro procedures were translated appropriately, despite experimenting with several prompt patterns. For example, Figure 7 shows the Java method generated by Llama-4-Scout. It is a piece of code that constructs another Java code, but the LLM was unable to generate the actual target code further. We observed similar results for the other macro procedures.

5 Future Plans

There are two primary directions planned for future work.

Expansion of Benchmarks: In the current experiments, the benchmark dataset was constructed based on a limited set of patterns of PL/I macro procedures derived from real-world code. In future work, we plan to investigate a broader range of patterns in actual code and expand the set of macro procedures targeted for transformation. Such datasets will provide more practical insights.

Generation of More Natural Java Code: This paper restricts the patterns of the target PL/I macro procedures to those that can be expressed using Java annotations. Java annotations help simplify code by abstracting complex logic and improves modularity allowing developers to focus on core functionality. However, annotations can introduce a learning cost and make the underlying behavior less transparent. The plain key-value-based Java code generated by the annotation processor often suffers from poor readability and runtime performance overhead. Therefore, we plan to explore techniques for further generating annotation-free and human-readable Java code.

6 Conclusion

Translating PL/I macro procedures into Java poses significant challenges due to their nature as code that generates code. Direct translation using LLMs often fails to capture the semantics of these macros. The templatization approach presented in this paper offers a robust solution that preserves code modularity and maintainability. We validated this approach through experiments on ten representative macro procedure patterns, all of which were successfully translated into Java using our method.

References

- [1] Meta AI. 2025. Llama-4-Scout-17B-16E-Instruct. <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-4-Scout-17B-16E-Instruct>.
- [2] Mistral AI. 2025. Mistral-Small-3.2-24B-Instruct-2506. <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-Small-3.2-24B-Instruct-2506>.
- [3] Sahil Bhatia, Jie Qiu, Niranjana Hasabnis, Sanjit A. Seshia, and Alvin Cheung. 2024. Verified Code Transpilation with LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03003* (2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2406.03003
- [4] IBM Corporation. 2022. *Enterprise PL/I for z/OS Language Reference*. San Jose, CA, USA. <https://www.ibm.com/docs/en/epfz/6.1.0?topic=reference-enterprise-pli-zos-language-SC31-5716-00>.
- [5] Prithwish Jana, Piyush Jha, Haoyang Ju, Gautham Kishore, Aryan Mahajan, and Vijay Ganesh. 2024. CoTran: An LLM-Based Code Translator Using Reinforcement Learning with Feedback from Compiler and Symbolic Execution. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications* 392 (2024), 4011–4018. doi:10.3233/FAIA240968 ECAI 2024.
- [6] Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, Ge Li, Lidong Zhou, Linjun Shou, Long Zhou, Michele Tufano, Ming Gong, Ming Zhou, Nan Duan, Neel Sundaresan, Shao Kun Deng, Shengyu Fu, and Shujie Liu. 2021. CodeXGLUE: A Machine Learning Benchmark Dataset for Code Understanding and Generation. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.04664>
- [7] Marcos Macedo, Yuan Tian, Pengyu Nie, Filipe R. Cogo, and Bram Adams. 2025. InterTrans: Leveraging Transitive Intermediate Translations to Enhance LLM-Based Code Translation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 47th International Conference on Software Engineering* (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada) (ICSE '25). IEEE Press, 1153–1164. doi:10.1109/ICSE55347.2025.00236
- [8] Nishath Rajiv Ranasinghe, Shawn M. Jones, Michal Kucer, Ayan Biswas, Daniel O'Malley, Alexander Most, Selma Liliane Wana, and Ajay Sreekumar. 2025. LLM-Assisted Translation of Legacy FORTRAN Codes to C++: A Cross-Platform Study. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on AI and Scientific Discovery: Directions and Opportunities*, Peter Jansen, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, Harsh Trivedi, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Tom Hope, Tushar Khot, Doug Downey, and Eric Horvitz (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, 58–69. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.aisd-main.6
- [9] Weixiang Yan, Yuchen Tian, Yunzhe Li, Qian Chen, and Wen Wang. 2023. CodeTransOcean: A Comprehensive Multilingual Benchmark for Code Translation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 5067–5089. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.337